

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

lu

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/622,955	07/18/2003	Justin K. Brask	ITL.1021US (P16708)	3990	
7590 06/03/2005			EXAMINER		
Timothy N. Trop			CRANE, SARA W		
TROP, PRUNE STE 100	R & HU, P.C.	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
8554 KATY FV	· -	2811			
HOUSTON, T	X 77024-1841	DATE MAILED: 06/03/2005			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		App	lication No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		''	622,955	BRASK ET AL.			
		Exa	miner	Art Unit	T		
		Sara	a W. Crane	2811			
The M/ Period for Reply	AILING DATE of this commun	ication appears	on the cover sheet with th	e correspondence ad	ddress		
THE MAILING - Extensions of time after SIX (6) MOI - If the period for received f	ED STATUTORY PERIOD F & DATE OF THIS COMMUNI ne may be available under the provisions NTHS from the mailing date of this comment eply specified above is less than thirty (3 eply is specified above, the maximum strictly in the set or extended period for reply ed by the Office later than three months arm adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	CATION. of 37 CFR 1.136(a). It nunication. 0) days, a reply within atutory period will apply will, by statute, cause	n no event, however, may a reply be the statutory minimum of thirty (30) y and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS fo the application to become ABANDC	days will be considered time tom the mailing date of this one			
Status							
1)⊠ Respon	sive to communication(s) file	ed on <u>17 March</u>	<u>2005</u> .				
2a) This act	☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This action is non-final.						
·	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of C	laims						
4a) Of th 5) ☐ Claim(s 6) ☑ Claim(s 7) ☐ Claim(s	4) Claim(s) 1-11 and 17-27 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-11, 17-27 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
Application Pape	ers						
9)∐ The spe	cification is objected to by th	e Examiner.					
10)∐ The drav	0) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Applican							
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35	i U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 							
Attachment(s)			_				
	ences Cited (PTO-892) person's Patent Drawing Review (F	TO 048)	4) Interview Summ Paper No(s)/Mai				
	closure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or			al Patent Application (PT	O-152)		

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-11 and 17-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In each of the independent claims, "selectively removing" is not clear. Applicant states in the remarks of 17 March 2005, "A masking process is non-selective." A masking process, as understood by the examiner, would be a process where a mask protects underlying layers, for example, from the action of an etchant, while layers not protected by the mask are etched away by the etchant. This would seem to be quite selective. The etchant removes the material not under the mask (for example) and does not remove material that is protected by the mask. Also, Applicant has submitted a definition of "selective etching" that appears to describe exactly what happens when a mask is used. (One material (not under the mask) is etched rapidly, which another material (protected by the mask, or the mask itself) is etched very slowly or not at all.)

So the claim language of "selectively removing" encompasses a masking process, and Applicant's remarks assert the contrary, which is confusing.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Application/Control Number: 10/622,955

Art Unit: 2811

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

Claims 1, 4, and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Brask et al., 6,696,327.

See reasons of record in the Office action of 14 January 2005.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brask et al., 6,696,327.

See reasons of record in the previous Office action.

Applicant argues that the previous Brask patent does not show selective etching, because Applicant believes that a mask would have been used. As noted above, no explanation or definition has been provided as to why a masking process would not give

Art Unit: 2811

rise to a selective etch or a selective removal. The mask itself selects what is to be removed, and what is not to be removed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to S. Crane, whose telephone number is (571) 272-1652.

The supervisor for Art Unit 2811, Eddie Lee can be reached on (571) 272-1732. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Sara W. Crane Primary Examiner Art Unit 2811